

inevitably mean higher costs for seniors and restricted choice of physician.

If you were the homeowner, you would say, "Well, wait a minute. Show me the plan on how you're going to fix my home with that wrecking ball."

We in Congress and the seniors of this country should say, "Wait a minute. Show us the plan in terms of how you're going to fix Medicare with that \$270 billion cut."

They have no plan. They have not shown the plan. We deserve no less.

HELP US SOLVE THE MEDICARE CRISIS

(Mr. SOUDER asked for and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, Medicare will be bankrupt in 7 years. No amount of accusations against each other about robbing banks or telling stories is going to solve the problem. We cannot stick our heads in the sand. Medicare will go broke in 7 years. We must work together to solve the problem rather than just spit out rhetoric.

Many of you have a parent or grandparent who is 58 years of age and expecting Medicare benefits when they turn 65. They have worked hard all their lives, paid their taxes, and saved for their retirement. When they reach 65, however, and are getting ready to retire, there will be no Medicare waiting for them.

Mr. Speaker, for 30 years Medicare has enabled the seniors of this country to get the medical attention they need, and now the Democrats seem to want to stand by, yell a lot, but let the program die.

We Republicans will not stand for it. We are working to strengthen and preserve Medicare. I hope my Democrat colleagues will stop the rhetoric and help us solve the Medicare crisis.

DO NOT BREAK OUR 30-YEAR COMMITMENT TO SENIORS

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this week we celebrate the 30th anniversary of the creation of Medicare, and it is an event that is worth celebrating. Thirty years ago we made a commitment to the Nation's seniors when we said to them, "Never again will you go without health care. Never again will you be forced to squander your life's savings to pay a doctor's bill."

But now Medicare is in danger, real danger. The Republican budget, which cuts \$270 billion from Medicare, would end Medicare as we know it today. Thirty years ago, 93 percent of the Republicans in this body opposed the creation of Medicare, and now Republicans are closing in on a 30-year goal to end what they never wanted in the first place.

In 1965 we made a deal with seniors. We said, "You pay into this trust fund all of your working life and when you are unable to work any longer, we will use that money to pay for your health care costs."

Seniors have kept up their end of the bargain but now Republicans want to back down on our end. Medicare is the real Contract With America and Republicans should not break it.

IF YOU CARE ABOUT SENIORS, SAVE MEDICARE

(Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, this is the week of the 30th anniversary of Medicare. Republicans are working hard to make sure Medicare is available over the next 30 years. We wish the President was doing the same.

Instead, President Clinton is using the White House's resources and energies, not to mention taxpayers' dollars, to raid seniors' pension funds—not to save Medicare.

By promoting economically targeted investments [ETI's], which take into consideration the investment's benefit to society rather than the financial benefit to the retiree, the Clinton administration is depriving seniors of the most profitable return from their pension fund.

The Labor Department is supposed to protect your pension fund from being raided, not be the raider. And President Clinton is supposed to care about seniors, not shaft them.

THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA IN 1965: MEDICARE

(Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago, we made a contract with the American people, particularly our elderly. We said, if you work hard and pay your Medicare taxes, you will have a guaranteed insurance program for your medical care that will free you from the threat of financial disaster in your retirement years.

The fact that one of the first things the Republicans have done since they took over Congress in January is to launch an assault on the Medicare Program by voting for \$270 billion in Medicare cuts to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy should come as no surprise. The Republicans never wanted Medicare, they never liked it.

Suddenly, 30 years after they tried to block the program, they have come up with a plan for Medicare; a plan that will limit choice of doctors and hospitals, will double premiums, and will mean higher deductibles.

In just 6 months, House Republicans have passed, adopted, proposed, and

drafted significant changes to the Medicare Program. Changes that will effectively take away the security that the Medicare Program represents to our seniors and that a single fact best summarizes: Before Medicare, 1 in 3 elderly Americans lived in poverty. Thirty years later, it is close to 1 in 10.

Can our elderly afford \$1,650 more for premiums to cover their doctor bills? Can the elderly really afford \$1,700 more for the same or less health care in 1 year alone? Will the proposed vouchers cover them against sudden premium increases if they get sick? Is it fair to make older Americans give up their doctors and be forced into managed care? As President Clinton stated yesterday, the answer to every single one of these questions is no. No.

While House Republicans believe they have devised a contract to meet the political whims of the day, Democrats made a commitment with Americans in 1965 when Medicare was enacted. Let me assure you that President Clinton and the Democrats intend to keep that commitment. Our seniors deserve no less.

MEDICARE IS A FAMILY ISSUE

(Mr. OLIVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, Americans celebrate the 30th birthday of Medicare and Americans will celebrate the medical security that Medicare gives to our senior citizens.

I am sure there are people listening who just turned 30 who are thinking: "This doesn't affect me? Why should I care?" I'll tell you why you should care.

When the Republicans cut \$270 billion from Medicare and use most of that to give tax breaks to the wealthiest handful of Americans, those cuts will make Medicare too expensive for many seniors who will have no place to turn for help except to their adult children.

How else will seniors pay a deductible that has doubled, or pay a monthly premium that has doubled, or pay a new copayment for home care? How else will they pay the specialist not covered by the managed care plan they have been forced into?

Young people cannot ignore the Republican attack on Medicare; 30-year-olds, seniors, and everyone in between should remember that Medicare is not just a seniors issue, it is a family issue.

□ 1240

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today

while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule.

The Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on National Security, the Committee on Science, the Committee on Small Business, and the Permanent Committee on Intelligence.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that our Democratic leadership has been consulted on this matter and we have no objection to the request, so I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 2076, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

POSTPONING VOTES ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2076, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of H.R. 2076, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 198, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment, and that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). Pursuant to House Resolution 198 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2076.

□ 1241

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. GUNDERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GUNDERSON). When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 25, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has been disposed of and title I was open for amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to title I?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, domestic violence is not just a private matter anymore; these private dramas are spilling out into public places, endangering family members and strangers. In Colorado alone, the following incidents have happened:

May 3, 1995: A teenage boy entered a Denver grocery store, pulled a gun on his former girlfriend, whom he had been stalking, and her friend. Police shot and killed him, only to find out it was a fake gun.

April 28, 1995: A man walked into a Denver grocery store, where he shot and killed his wife, the store director, and a sheriff's deputy who arrived on the scene. He then left the store, as customers crouched in the aisles and shielded their children. He entered the parking lot, spraying it with bullets as people ran for cover. He hit a pregnant woman in the leg; she lived. He apparently had made several threats that he was going to kill his wife. A few days earlier, she had gotten a restraining order against him, but it hadn't been served yet because there was some missing information and the court clerk couldn't reach her. She had also just filed for divorce and had received temporary custody of their son.

April 1994: A Boulder police officer was shot and killed while responding to a domestic dispute. The male suspect shot and killed himself at the scene.

April 1994: In Aurora, a man allegedly shot and killed his ex-girlfriend and her 2½-year-old son and wounded his twin brother.

July 1993: An Aurora man threatened with divorce shot his wife, crippling her, and killed her sister.

January 1988: A man shot and killed his wife outside a divorce courtroom in Littleton. He also wounded the man he thought was her lover.

January 1986: An Aurora police officer shot and wounded his wife's divorce lawyer.

My colleagues, I am very sorry we did not fully fund the Violence Against Women Act.

I'm also very sorry we had to fight so hard for the money we got. It is clear that if the Congresswomen hadn't been constantly monitoring this—the amount would be zero. That is incredible when the act passed last year 421 to 0. What a difference a year makes. So there is some funding thanks to the hard work of NITA LOWEY, but we are still \$50 million short. Women still must beg for every dollar.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, a vote to restore some of the funds to the Violence Against Women Act is a vote to fulfill only a part of the promise Congress made to help victims of domestic violence. This promise was made to make America and the home a safer place for women.

Last August, the Congress passed the Violence Against Women Act, a promise to finally treat domestic violence like the crime that it is, to improve law enforcement, to make the streets safer for women, and to vigorously prosecute perpetrators. We promised more counseling and more shelters to provide a safe haven for abused women. Now this Congress threatens to backtrack on our promise and abandon these promises to combat domestic violence.

Under the amendment, the Violence Against Women Act receives only a fraction of the promised authorization of \$175 million to fund justice grants to combat violence against women. And while I appreciate the efforts of the committee to add \$50 million to the bill for the program, the shortfall is still severe and I fear may be interpreted as a message to battered women that there are few resources for them, only empty promises.

A shelter in San Pedro, CA, in my district, desperately needs the money authorized in the Violence Against Women Act to implement its programs to combat domestic violence. Two women whom Rainbow Services had been helping were killed in the last 6 months—women whose lives could have been saved had they been able to stay at the shelter longer. These women came forward and tried to do the right thing, but the resources were not there to keep them away from their abusers long enough. The grants in the Violence Against Women Act money translate into saving human lives.

Rainbow Services has waiting lists for counseling, beds, and all of its other services. The number of women who come seeking help has doubled in the last 3 months since a domestic violence hotline was established in May. The increased funds from California's grant only constitutes half of what they need for their emergency response program, a program operating 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. They just received a grant for a new shelter—the first shelter for battered elderly women in the area—and the Violence Against Women Act grants are critical to its operation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the amendment to restore some funding for the Violence Against Women Act. It is critical that we keep our promise to help victims of domestic violence—they cannot wait any longer.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment to increase funding for the Justice Department's violence against women programs.

Just 1 year ago, the Violence Against Women Act was passed in the House with overwhelming bipartisan support. Yet today, the funding allocation for these programs has